

N1294-S/DEEP-5

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-10 and 13-22 are pending.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,327,592 to Yoshikawa in view of U.S. Patent 5,64,317 to Sadovnik et al. (Sadovnik). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method of displaying data in a software program on a multi-layer display having at least two screens, the method comprising the steps of:
a) assigning a particular screen designation code to a first group of data, and
b) assigning other screen designation codes to second and other groups of data,
wherein the screen designation codes determine on which of the screens in the multi layer display the group of data is displayed.

The Examiner states that "Yoshikawa discloses the screen designation code determining on which screen in the multilayer display the group of data is displayed in Figure 7..." but then states that "Yoshikawa fails to disclose the multi-layer display as having at least two screens" and "...it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the multi-layer display of data as taught by Yoshikawa...."

It is respectfully submitted that there is virtually no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a "multi-layer display of data" or a "screen designation code" in Yoshikawa. Figure 7 of

N1294-5/DEEP-5

Yoshikawa does not show a multi-layer display. Yoshikawa at col. 7, lines 60-61, states that Figure 7 shows a single display screen. Therefore, Yoshikawa can not and does not disclose "the screen designation code determining on which screen in the multilayer display the group of data is displayed in Figure 7" as alleged by the Examiner. Moreover, Yoshikawa is mainly concerned with methods for calculating data and data structures and describes how to increase the efficiency of revising data structures and how the data structure can be built so that new variables or information can be easily incorporated. The display of the data is only briefly mentioned, for example, at column 9 lines 50,51, "data structures are displayed in a format of the multi-window systems." Hence, Yoshikawa is not concerned with the display medium and merely defines a new mechanism for calculating data structures.

Sadovnik discloses a projector and a volumetric screen formed by multiple layers of polymer dispersed liquid crystal (PDLC) films. The PDLC films can be electrically switched between a diffusing (scattering) state and a transparent state. A 3-D image stored in a host computer is used to generate a number of cross-sections or slices perpendicular to the viewing direction. Each slice is projected by the projector and each projected slice is synchronized in time with the activation of one layer of the volumetric screen. This process is sequentially repeated for each image slice (each respective display layer), so that the observer will have a view of a full 3-D image. Sufficiently rapid sequential switching of the images produces the perception of continuous motion.

Hence, there is no motivation for modifying Yoshikawa with Sadovnik in the manner proposed by the Examiner. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resulting combination obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability or motivation for making the combination. Specifically, Yoshikawa is concerned with a data

N1294-5/DEEP-5

calculator for calculating a data structure and not with three-dimensional volume visualization as taught by Sadovnik, so one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Sadovnik to modify Yoshikawa in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Because Yoshikawa in view of Sandovnik are not combinable and, thus, fail to arrive at the invention of claim 1, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Likewise, claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 10, which depend from claim 1 and recite additional features of the invention, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as stated for claim 1. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

3. Claims 13-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,859,907 to McGarry in view of Sadovnik.

Claim 13 requires a “a multi-layer display having front and back screens.” Independent claim 18 requires “a multilayer screen comprising front and back screens.”

McGarry does not describe “a multi-layer display having front and back screens” or “a multilayer screen comprising front and back screens,” as respectively required in claim 13 and claim 18. Col. 3, lines 8-22 of McGarry describes a monitor having a single screen that displays a semitransparent spreadsheet superimposed on an image and graphics layer to form a composite display.

As described above, Sadovnik discloses a multiple layer volumetric display formed by multiple PDLC films for three-dimensional volume visualization.

There is no motivation for modifying McGarry with Sadovnik in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, McGarry is concerned with making an electronic spreadsheet

N1294-5/DEEP-5

variably transparent so that an underlying image and graphic layer can be seen through the spreadsheet, thus, improving the spreadsheet for machine vision applications and other applications using large data sets. McGarry is not concerned with three-dimensional volume visualization as taught by Sadovnik, therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Sadovnik to modify McGarry in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Because McGarry and Sadovnik are not combinable and, thus fail to arrive at the invention of claims 13 and 18, claims 13 and 18 are allowable thereover. Likewise, claims 14-17, which depend from claim 13 and recite additional features of the invention and claims 19-22, which depend from claim 18 and recite additional features of the invention, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as stated for claims 13 and 18. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

4. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested as it is believed that all outstanding issues have been addressed herein and, further, that claims 1-10 and 13-22 are in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or matters whose resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

5. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of the fee for the petition for the one (1) month extension of time and any other filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and

N1294-S/DEEP-S

any other patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17, which are associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Schwarz
Registration. No. 37,577

DUANE MORRIS LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5203
Tel: (609) 631-2446
Fax: (609) 631-2401